

## **Pape, Zachary**

---

**From:** Jimenez, Marc  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:36 AM  
**To:** Pape, Zachary  
**Subject:** RE: application10807183

Zachary,

Only claims 13-21 would be accepted in Class 29 since we don't have an area for product claims. I would suggest restricting claims 5-12 and claims 13-21 by indicating that the product claims 5-12 could be made by a process with has a step other than "plugging said vent hole" as recited in claim 13. For example, the potting compound could be selectively filled in the case by filling everywhere except for the vent hole. The hole does not have to be plugged to make the final product.

Marc

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pape, Zachary  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:11 AM  
**To:** Jimenez, Marc  
**Subject:** application10807183

Marc,

Could you please take a look at claims13-21 and claim 5-12 and advise on a possible method restriction? Claims 5-12 fail to claim a method, however the claims clearly follow the syntax of being method claims. Claims 13-21 are pretty straightforward.

I apologize in advance if this isn't something that would be classified in 29/ however I didn't know where else to begin.

Thanks!

**Zachary M. Pape**  
AU 2835  
Jeff-8A20  
(571)-272-2201  
Zachary.Pape@uspto.gov